

### **Remarks**

After the foregoing amendment, Claims 7-16, 21-23 and 26-27 are pending. Claims 1-6, 17-20 and 24-25 have been withdrawn. Claims 7, 21 and 26 being the independent claims.

Pursuant to the office action, paragraph 17 Allowable Subject Matter, claims 7, 14, 21, 26, and 27 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base claims and any intervening claims. The applicant has amended these claims making claim 7, 21 and 26 independent and including all the limitations for the preceding base claims and intervening claims, claim 14 and 27 now depend from the rewritten claims including all limitations. Claims 8-16, and 22-23 should now be in a condition of for allowance as they depend from claim.s 7 and 21 which have been amended pursuant to the examiners request.

### ***Specification***

In regard to the objections to the specification, the specification has been amended accordingly.

### ***Drawings***

In regard to the objections to the drawings, the drawings have been amended to identify the rubber gasket as element number 180 and the electrical line as element number 256, which brings the drawings in line with the corresponding description in the specification. Applicant submits that no new matter has been added by the amendment to the drawings and respectfully request withdrawal of the objection to the drawings.

***Claim Objections***

The claim amendments suggested in the claim objections section have all been made and are set forth in the Amendments to the Claims section above.

***Claim Rejections***

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) has been anticipated by Anderson et al. (6,776,158). Claims 1 and 2 have been withdrawn and the subject matter of these claims has been incorporated into Claim 7. Claim 7 as redrafted is not anticipated by Anderson et al.

Claim 3,5,6,8 - 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. ("103(a)") in light of Anderson et al. (6,776,158) in view Leong (4,348,985). Claim 7 and 8 -10 have been redrafted to incorporate all limitations of the previous claim. In light of the redrafting of these claims they are not anticipated by Anderson in view Leong.

Claim 4 is rejected under 103(a) in light of Anderson (6,776,158) in view of Leong (4,348,985) in view of King (2,141,794). Claim 4 has been withdrawn as such this rejection is no longer at issue.

Claims 11, 12, 13, 15 have been rejected under 103(a) in light of Anderson (6,776,158) in view of Leong (4,348,985) in view of French (6,352,076). Claims 11, 12, 13, currently stem from redrafted Claim 7, these claims are no longer anticipated by Anderson in view of Leong and French and as such should be allowed.

Claim 17 is rejected under 103(a) and is anticipated by Anderson (6,776,158). Claim 17 has been withdrawn from this application and this rejection is no longer at issue.

Claims 18 – 20, 22 are rejected under 103(a) and is anticipated by Anderson (6,776,158) in view of French (6,352,076). Claims 18 – 20 have been withdrawn in this action and as such this rejection is no longer at issue. Claim 22 has been redrafted to incorporate the previous claim limitations and as such is no longer anticipated by Anderson in view of French, as such Claim 22 should be allowed.

Claim 23 has been rejected under 103(a) in light of Anderson (6,776,158) in view of French (6,352,076) in view of Thomas (4,690,100). Claim 23 now stems from Claim 29 which has been redrafted and Claim 23 is no longer anticipated by Anderson in view of French and Thomas and as such should be allowed.

Claim 24 has been rejected under 103(a) and in light of Anderson (6,776,158) in view of Wensly et al (US 2003/0062042). Claim 24 has been withdrawn in this application and as such this rejection is no longer at issue.

Claim 25 has been rejected under 103(a) in light of Anderson (6,776,158) in view of Wensly (US 2003/0062042) in view of Lugtigheid et al. (6,158,434). Claim 25 has been withdrawn in this application and as such is no longer at issue.

**Conclusion**

Based on the forgoing amendments and remarks this applicant respectfully requests that this patent be allowed for issuance. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding the above Amendments and Remarks, the Examiner is respectfully urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

2/16/07

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Lisel M. Ferguson  
Reg. No. 48,139

Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch LLP  
530 B Street, Suite 2100  
San Diego, California 92101-4469  
(619) 238-1900